

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2504th MEETING: 16 DECEMBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2504)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa: Letter dated 14 December 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16216)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2504th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 16 December 1983, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Max VAN DER STOEL
(Netherlands).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2504)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 14 December 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16216)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:

Letter dated 14 December 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16216)

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Angola, Botswana, Brazil, India, Mauritania, Mozambique, Portugal, Somalia, South Africa, Yugoslavia and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Ould Hamody (Mauritania), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Medina (Portugal), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the

places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter addressed to the President of the Security Council on 14 December 1983 by the representative of Angola.

3. I should also like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/16219, which contains the text of a letter dated 15 December from the representative of South Africa to the Secretary-General.

4. The first speaker is the representative of Angola, upon whom I now call.

5. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. President, I thank you and the other Council members for agreeing to meet so promptly. My Government made an urgent request for this meeting of the Council for a number of reasons.

6. There has been a full-scale war by the racist armed forces of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola since 1981. Prior to that, since 1975, the racist troops had carried out regular acts of aggression against the territory and people of Angola, starting within the hour of the proclamation of Angolan independence on 11 November 1975.

7. This full-scale war is being supported in various overt and covert ways by certain States Members of the United Nations, without whose backing the racist troops would not be able to carry out destabilizing attempts against the sovereign and legitimate Government of Angola.

8. My Government issued a White Paper on acts of aggression by the racist South African régime against Angola, which my Government requested be circulated as a document of the Security Council on 5 December; for unfortunate reasons, it has not yet been distributed.* This document, which the Angola Mission has distributed in the Council, gives a summary of the racist acts in the period 1975 to mid-1982. These acts of aggression not only have continued, but have intensified from mid-1982 to the present.

9. My Government has brought our case to the Council on a number of occasions.

* Subsequently circulated as document S/16198.

10. In March 1976, the Council adopted resolution 387 (1976), demanding that "South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity" of my country and calling upon the racist régime to pay full compensation.

11. In May 1978, the Council adopted resolution 428 (1978), repeating that demand and demanding also the "immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African forces from Angola".

12. In March 1979, the Council adopted resolution 447 (1979), demanding that "South Africa cease immediately its provocative armed invasions against the People's Republic of Angola and that it respect forthwith the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity" of my country.

13. In November 1979, the Council adopted resolution 454 (1979), strongly condemning South Africa's aggression and called upon the racist Government "to cease immediately all acts of aggression and provocation against the People's Republic of Angola and forthwith to withdraw all its armed forces from Angola".

14. In June 1980, the Council adopted resolution 475 (1980), in which it demanded that the racist régime "withdraw forthwith all its military forces from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, cease all violations of Angola's air space and, henceforth, scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola", called upon all States "to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in Security Council resolution 418 (1977)", and decided "to meet again in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola by the South African racist régime, in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof".

15. In August 1981, the Government and the people of Angola made an anguished appeal to the Council [S/14654] after a massive invasion of my country and the military occupation of parts of southern Angola—an occupation which continues to this date.

16. The draft resolution then before the Council [S/14664/Rev.2] strongly condemned the racist régime for its premeditated, unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression of Angola; declared that the armed invasion was a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and constituted a breach of international peace and security; demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from Angola; strongly condemned the use by South Africa of mercenaries against the Government and people of Angola; condemned the aggressive campaign and other hostile activities aimed at destabilizing the People's Republic of Angola; and called for implementation of the arms embargo imposed in 1977 against

South Africa and for full and adequate compensation by South Africa to Angola.

17. This draft resolution was vetoed by a super-Power, a permanent member of the Council, 13 other members having voted in favour and one having abstained [2300th meeting, para. 45]. As a result of that veto, the racist South African troops are still in occupation of southern Angola.

18. The Council is the supreme peace-keeping organ of the United Nations. I quote Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Charter of the United Nations, as follows:

"In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

In the face of the Council's impotence and inability to help Angola, the victim of racist aggression, in the face of its paralysis because of the veto exercised by a super-Power, to what court of justice should the people of Angola turn? In which international forum should we seek redress? Which international organization will deliver Angola—and, indeed, all of southern Africa—from the criminal madness of this monster in our midst?

19. In a gesture of calculated cynicism, the racist régime, upon hearing of my Government's request that a Council meeting be convened, made a tactical move aimed at diffusing expressions of support for the Angolan position and the Angolan cause, and at giving its allies the dubious distinction of being able to point with pride to the fact that, at last, their policy of constructive engagement is paying off.

20. It is such racist tactics and strategies that we in southern Africa have learned, through bitter experience with Pretoria and through trust in its allies, to be extremely wary of. The price we have paid in learning this lesson is thousands dead and injured beyond rehabilitation, occupation of our sovereign territory, sneak attacks on our vital installations, economic sabotage, recruitment and use of mercenaries against life and property in sovereign States and efforts to destabilize the legitimate Governments of southern Africa—in particular, that of Angola.

21. The records of the various organs of the United Nations are replete with instances of racist South Africa's duplicity and basic intransigence, though these may sometimes be disguised by gestures which are made to appear conciliatory.

22. In fact, despite the letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of racist South Africa to the Secretary-General of 27 August 1981 [S/14652] and the publicity given the South African "offer", I was informed by my Government in the early hours of this morning that in

fact four columns of racist troops made up of armoured corps are mounting an offensive into the province of Huila; a clash already took place, on 14 December, near Mulongo, between the racist aggressors and the valiant People's Forces for the Liberation of Angola (FAPLA) soldiers defending our country.

23. I ask the Council this: is this latest offensive commensurate with the sentiments expressed in the above-mentioned letter? Will the Council once more allow itself to be duped by South Africa's wiles? Even a cursory reading of that letter reveals that in fact the racist régime has really made no offer at all; all that the letter contains is a vague statement that it is prepared to begin a disengagement, but it does not talk of withdrawal. Furthermore, it again brings up the issue of linkage, which the Government of Angola, supported in this by most nations of the world, rejects absolutely and categorically.

24. The withdrawal of the racist soldiers and mercenaries from the territory of sovereign Angola is non-negotiable; it is Angola's inherent right under international law on statehood and national sovereignty. After this unconditional withdrawal, which is one of the four points enunciated by Comrade José Eduardo Dos Santos, President of the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA-PT) Workers' Party and President of the People's Republic of Angola, as a *sine qua non* for a solution to the problems in southern Africa, we can discuss other issues, on which the Angolan people's commitment remains as strong as ever. But first the racist régime must withdraw its five battalions which are situated in Chitado, Xangongo, Ionde, Evale and Mulemba.

25. Some of the details of the military occupation by the racist armed forces and their military operations inside our territory are set out in the White Paper I spoke of [S/16198, annex]. In addition, the racist armed forces carry out at least three reconnaissance flights per week from military air strips in Ondangua, Ruacana, Runto and Grootfontein in the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia, utilizing Mirage III, F-7, Canberra, Impala and Buccaneer aircraft and Puma SA-330, Super Frelon and Alouette II and III helicopters.

26. It is stated categorically in Article 25 of the Charter that Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter. And yet we have here a racist Member of the Organization which has since 1976 refused to do so, with absolute impunity, while Angola, a Member State of the Organization, which has never violated any decision of the United Nations or of any of its organs, is punished time and again by the unwillingness of the Council to enforce measures that could rectify the situation.

27. The Angolan Government has never refused or been afraid to meet, talk or negotiate. Time and again

we have met friends and foes to seek some way out of this impasse. But there are some revolutionary principles on which we will not compromise—our national sovereignty and territorial integrity among them.

28. Angola is an African State, a southern African State, a front-line State. We are aware of our duties and responsibilities, and will continue to discharge them. But, as a Member of the United Nations, we have the right to expect supportive action, especially from the Security Council, whose permanent members have the duty not to make a mockery of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations by using the veto to block the course of justice.

29. The gains claimed by the forces of imperialism all over the world, and by their *apartheid* ally in South Africa in particular, are temporary and pyrrhic. Their cost will ultimately be incalculable in human, political, military and economic terms. History is on our side, and revolutions never go backwards, although they may suffer an occasional setback.

30. While our final victory approaches, the *apartheid* régime, if I may paraphrase Huxley, distracts attention from the real point at issue by eloquent digressions and skilled appeals.

31. If the international community does not condemn the guilty it exonerates them, and if the Security Council does not condemn racist South Africa for its military occupation of Angolan territory, and force its withdrawal, then we are forced to the conclusion that this peace-keeping organ by its impotence and inaction legitimizes war.

32. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker on the list is the representative of South Africa, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

33. Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): Mr. President, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to convey to you our congratulations and best wishes on your assumption of the presidency of the Council.

34. Once again the Council has been called together to consider the situation in southern Angola. However, the factors which have brought about this situation have not changed since the Council last considered this question, in August 1981 [2296th to 2300th meetings].

35. First, South Africa's security operations in southern Angola have one objective and one objective only: the protection of South West Africa (Namibia) against SWAPO [South West Africa People's Organization] terrorist attacks.

36. SWAPO has murdered more than 1,300 South West Africans (Namibians) since it began its terrorist campaign against the people of the Territory. It has conducted a systematic campaign of intimidation

against its political opponents and has been responsible for the assassination of more than 25 important political leaders, including Chief Clemens Kapuuo, Toivo Shyagaya, Filemon Nika, Chief Elifas, Paulus Hamalua Heita, Thomas Hikongo and Oswald Andawa.

37. In addition, more than 1,000 South West Africans (Namibians) have been maimed or seriously injured as a result of SWAPO's violent activities. Eleven hundred people, mostly schoolchildren, have been abducted from the Territory. SWAPO now relies on such abductions and recruitment of Angolan citizens to replenish its terrorist bands.

38. These actions, and not its United Nations rhetoric, are SWAPO's response to the prospect of free and fair elections in South West Africa (Namibia). Since all parties to this dispute have agreed that South West Africa (Namibia) should become independent on the basis of free and fair elections, SWAPO ought to state why it continues with this senseless campaign of violence, for as long as it continues to do so, South Africa will take whatever action is necessary to defend the people of the Territory. In particular, South Africa will not allow SWAPO bands to establish sanctuaries north of the border in Angola, from where they can carry out their raids against the inhabitants of the Territory.

39. In keeping with the Charter of the United Nations, South Africa would have much preferred to resolve this problem by peaceful means. Indeed, South Africa has explored all the possibilities for a negotiated solution. In no less than 54 letters to the former Secretary-General, South Africa brought to the attention of the United Nations details of the hundreds of murders that had been perpetrated by SWAPO. South Africa repeatedly urged the former Secretary-General to use his good offices to bring about a cessation of armed attacks against South West Africa (Namibia) from Angola. However, its letters were ignored. On several occasions South Africa sought to put its case to the General Assembly, but its right to do so was simply brushed aside, obviously because the majority in the United Nations finds the truth unpalatable. When the representatives of the Territory, who were suffering from SWAPO attacks, sought to express their grievances, the Council was not even prepared to give them a hearing. Far from playing the role envisaged in the Charter for the peaceful resolution of disputes, the United Nations has been one of the main instigators and supporters of SWAPO's terrorist violence against the people of the Territory.

40. Having exhausted the possibilities of preventing aggression through the United Nations, South Africa attempted to resolve the problem directly with the MPLA régime. On 7 and 8 December 1982, a South African delegation, led by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, held promising talks with an MPLA delegation in the Cape Verde Islands. A formula was proposed which could have led to the cessation of armed activities in the border area and the withdrawal

of SWAPO and Cuban forces above certain latitudes in Angola. It was hoped that this process would lead to the establishment of peace in the border area and that it would make an important contribution to the settlement of the broader problems of the region. A second meeting between ministerial delegations from South Africa and the MPLA régime was accordingly arranged to take place in the Cape Verde Islands on 23 February 1983, to make further progress towards what was believed to be a common objective, namely, the establishment of peace in the border area.

41. However, SWAPO, actively supported by the MPLA régime, chose the eve of the second round of talks to launch its largest-ever offensive against the people of South West Africa (Namibia). Although South Africa would have been justified in doing so, it did not cancel the talks but sent a senior delegation to the Cape Verde Islands to make it clear that the talks could not continue unless the FAPLA and SWAPO manifested the same military restraint that South Africa had for a number of months maintained. South Africa also made it clear that an overall solution to the problems of the region would require the withdrawal of the Cubans from the whole of Angola.

42. South Africa informed the MPLA régime on a number of occasions that it would be prepared to continue its bilateral discussions on this basis. However, the MPLA régime had clearly decided to abandon the process of peaceful negotiation and to seek to achieve its objectives by other means.

43. Despite this attitude, South Africa's offer still stands. South Africa has no desire to control a single centimetre of Angolan territory—not a single centimetre—and, although it differs radically with the policies and approach of the MPLA régime, it is prepared to examine the possibility of peaceful coexistence with all the States of the region. South Africa has repeatedly stated that the moment SWAPO undertakes to cease its campaign of violence, and in fact carries out such a commitment, action against SWAPO by the South African forces will cease. In such circumstances, there would of course be no necessity for South African military action across the border against SWAPO elements in Angola.

44. The solution to the present problem is very simple. The MPLA, in accordance with international law, should ensure that its territory is not used for the launching of terrorist attacks against its neighbours. The MPLA régime is aware of this, and yet it persists in supporting SWAPO's policy of aggression. It has requested this meeting of the Council to hide its own aggressive designs against the people of South West Africa (Namibia) and to distract attention from its own serious internal problems. These problems have arisen from the imposition on Angola of an ideology which is utterly alien to the peoples of Africa. The fact of the matter is that the authority of the MPLA régime does not derive from the freely expressed wishes of the

Angolan people, but from the military force of foreign troops. The MPLA will not solve its problems by pretending that they are all caused by South Africa. If there are members of this Council who believe the MPLA's propaganda that South Africa is responsible for the present situation in Angola, then we challenge the MPLA to invite members of the Council to go to Angola and to assess the situation freely for themselves.

45. By requesting this meeting, the MPLA also hopes to justify the presence in Angola of the Cuban and other surrogates which it has invited to suppress the Angolan people. The Cubans are not there to fight South Africa; they are there to fight the people of Angola. They are not there to defend the independence of a sovereign Government; they are there to prop up an unrepresentative, unelected and unpopular clique. They are not the allies of Africa in the struggle for liberation; they are the vanguard of the new imperialists and colonialists, and their eyes are as much on Lusaka, Kinshasa, Gaborone, Brazzaville and Libreville as they are on Windhoek and Pretoria. If the Council seeks evidence in this regard, it might consult the peoples of Poland and Afghanistan, and many others.

46. One day Africa will realize that the South Africa forces in the Angolan-South West Africa border area, which it now so vehemently condemns, are in fact fighting in defence of the whole of Africa against a powerful and sinister threat to all African States. Nothing that the Council decides now or in the future can alter this basic fact. Indeed, many African leaders fear the same threat by the same super-Power and its surrogates, and the majority of the members of the Council know what the truth is, but would not admit it for reasons of their own.

47. Yesterday I conveyed the following message to the Secretary-General from the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information:

[The speaker read out the letter contained in annex I to the document published under the symbol S/16219.]

48. It will be realized that the South African Government's attitude towards further efforts to bring about a peaceful resolution of the South West Africa (Namibia) issue will be influenced by the response to this latest initiative for peace, the Angolan representative's cynical and regrettable remarks this afternoon notwithstanding.

49. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Somalia, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of December. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

50. Mr. ADAN (Somalia): Mr. President, permit me first of all to express the satisfaction of my delegation at seeing you presiding over the deliberations of the Council for this month of December. We are confident that

with your wide experience and known diplomatic skills, you will guide our work to a satisfactory conclusion.

51. Allow me also to extend to your predecessor, Mr. Gauci of Malta, our heartfelt gratitude for the able manner in which he presided over the meetings of the Council during the month of November.

52. I wish to thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to take part in this debate as Chairman of the Group of African States for December and also as the representative of my own country.

53. My delegation was anxious to speak because the question before the Council is one of direct concern to every Member of the United Nations. All States are affected when the rule of international law is allowed to break down in any area of the world, and there can be no doubt that South Africa's military aggressions directed against Angola over the past eight years and its current occupation of Angolan territory constitute a violation of the Charter principles and the norms of international law.

54. The facts about the situation are not in doubt. Numerous fact-finding missions, including those of the United Nations, have attested to the brutality of the South African aggressions and the extent of the damage inflicted.

55. Clearly, Angola is the victim of aggression as that term has been defined by the General Assembly in its resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974: its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity have been grossly violated; many of its towns and villages have been severely damaged or destroyed; the toll of the dead and wounded, who include civilians, refugees from racist oppression and women and children, runs into the thousands; hundreds of thousands have been made homeless, and the damage to property and to Angola's industrial and agricultural sectors must be assessed in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars.

56. This is an intolerable situation, and it is made even more untenable by South Africa's arrogant attempts to justify its actions with patently false arguments. Every possible judgement of international law has declared South Africa to be in illegal occupation of Namibia. A régime which has so grossly violated its international responsibilities cannot claim the right to use military force against those who oppose its illegal, racist and oppressive rule.

57. The liberation struggle of the people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, and Angola's support for that struggle have been declared legitimate by the General Assembly and by the Security Council. In our view, the Council must firmly reject South Africa's claim to be engaged in hot pursuit of so-called terrorists. The real terrorists are those who are engaged in the genocidal oppression of the majority in South Africa, spreading instability,

death and destruction throughout the southern African region. These policies are aimed at entrenching *apartheid* and obstructing the efforts of the United Nations to lead Namibia to independence.

58. Unfortunately, the experience of the past indicates that South Africa will continue on its lawless and belligerent path as long as it believes that it can do so with no more severe penalty than verbal condemnation, and as long as it continues to enjoy the support of its powerful friends.

59. The African States, and indeed all States which look to the United Nations as the source of collective security, find it incomprehensible that South Africa has been allowed to carry out with impunity its murderous attacks on Angola and other neighbouring countries and to occupy Angolan territory in clear violation of international law. The Council has recognized time and again that South Africa's actions have seriously damaged peace and security in southern Africa and pose a grave threat to international peace and security. However, the Council's repeated condemnations have been ineffective, and its call for adequate compensation for the damage to life and property in Angola has been contemptuously ignored.

60. Angola is a country whose people desire above all to go forward with the task of nation-building in peace and stability. If it cannot turn to the United Nations for protection and redress against the repeated and vicious attacks of its militarist neighbour, then it would seem that the world community has returned to the law of the jungle, and that instead of having "peace with progress" for our slogan we might as well proclaim that "might is right".

61. In June 1980, the Council agreed to consider the adoption of more effective measures in accordance with provisions of the Charter, including those of Chapter VII, in the event of further violations of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Since that time, as we are all aware, South Africa's murderous attacks on the civilian population and its illegal occupation of Angolan territory and the repeated violations of its airspace have continued unabated.

62. The Council is therefore called upon to carry out its primary responsibility for restoring international peace and security when it has been determined that acts of aggression and breaches of the peace have taken place. It is the profound hope of my delegation that the Council will fulfil the promise to Angola, indeed to the international community, contained in its resolution 475 (1980).

63. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of India, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity of Chairman of the Group of Non-Aligned States. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

64. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Mr. President, I am grateful to you and to the other members of the Council for affording my delegation this opportunity to participate in the Council's deliberations on a matter of great importance to the international community. Permit me to begin by extending to you our most sincere felicitations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. The Netherlands and India enjoy warm ties of friendship and co-operation, and we are particularly happy to see you in the Chair. You bring to your duties a wealth of wisdom as well as experience in statecraft and diplomacy acquired over many years. We hope that under your able stewardship the Council will close its deliberations for this year on a positive and purposeful note.

65. The Government of Angola has come once again before the Council, after a lapse of over two years, to remind the international community of the continued aggression being perpetrated against its territory and people by the racist and belligerent régime of South Africa. The issue before the Council today is one that sometimes tends to get obfuscated in the larger context of the situation in southern Africa and the question of Namibia. Indeed, it is one of the many ironies of the situation that those who make much of the presence of foreign forces on the territory of countries in the area should choose to gloss over or deliberately ignore the massive and prolonged presence of South African forces on a large part of Angolan soil, infringing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and casting an ominous shadow on the ever-fragile fabric of peace and stability in the region.

66. The representative of Angola has apprised the Council in vivid terms and with his customary eloquence of the seriousness of the situation which confronts his country. South African aggression against Angola is not a new phenomenon, having been almost a continuous factor since the achievement of independence by Angola in 1975. Several times in the past the Council has been seized of the problem. On most of those occasions, the Council has adopted resolutions condemning South Africa for its aggression and asking it to withdraw its forces immediately and unconditionally from Angolan territory. Yet, true to its character, the Pretoria régime continues to turn a deaf ear to the expressed will of the international community. It is a sad reflection upon the efficacy of the Council that its resolutions and decisions should be so defiantly cast to the winds by an intransigent Member State of the United Nations.

67. The statement we have just heard from the representative of the Pretoria régime only provides further proof, if proof were indeed needed, that South Africa attempts to hoodwink world opinion by seeking to divert attention to issues that are either fabrications or have no direct bearing upon the question under consideration. We have also learnt this morning of South Africa's proposal—if indeed it merits such a description—involving a so-called disengagement of forces

in Angola, contained in Security Council document S/16219 of 15 December. The timing of this communication is no coincidence. It is abundantly clear that this is yet another diversionary tactic which is part of the overall strategy of South Africa. The offer of disengagement is patently disingenuous because it mentions nothing about a South African withdrawal and is an attempt by an aggressor to set conditions for observance by the victim of its aggression. It also implies that South Africa claims the right to continue its military strikes and operations against and inside Angola and its intent to pursue its policy—postulates which could not possibly be accepted. The communication has also brought in considerations not relevant to the issue, which only goes to confirm that the object of this epistolary exercise is merely to make false propaganda.

68. South Africa's continued illegal occupation of a large part of Angolan territory, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, is of a piece with its larger strategy of destabilization in the entire region, whereby it carries out constant acts of aggression, subversion and every other kind of provocation directed against independent African States in the area, not to mention its continued illegitimate occupation of Namibia. Indeed, Namibia has been used time and again by Pretoria as a springboard to launch a campaign of terrorism, intimidation and aggression against neighbouring States, particularly Angola. Today, South African forces, together with the mercenaries and brigands that Pretoria commands, are sited well over 100 miles deep in Angolan territory, fortified with sophisticated and heavy armaments, spreading terror among the local population and Namibian refugees. Angolan airspace is violated at will by South African aircraft. Ground operations are also frequent. Only two days ago, on 14 December, as we have heard from reports, four columns of South African infantry based in the Angolan province of Cunene mounted an assault on Huila province and were engaged for 18 long hours in a fierce battle by units of the Angolan defence forces. In the post-independence period, acts of South African aggression have been responsible for total damage costing the economy of Angola about US\$ 10 billion. Valuable infrastructure and property have been destroyed. Thousands of people have been killed and many more mercilessly uprooted from their hearths and homes to eke out a miserable existence. The forces of the racist régime have perpetrated untold brutalities: pillage, rape, torture, aerial bombardment of civilian areas, and large-scale killing of innocent men, women and children. The horrible massacre of Namibian refugees and Angolans at Kassinga in May 1978 was just one of the many crimes which bring disgrace to Pretoria.

69. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has always stood steadfastly by the side of the Government and people of Angola. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March this year, in the Declaration it adopted,

"strongly condemned the continued military occupation of part of Angolan territory by the South African racist troops in violation of the national sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola. The Conference considered the occupation of Angolan territory as an act of aggression against the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory and decided to increase support for and solidarity with the people and Government of Angola in order to consolidate Angola's national independence, and safeguard its sovereignty and territorial integrity." [S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I., para. 62.

70. The Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 4 to 7 October,

"condemned the recent massive aggression carried out by South African forces against the village of Cangamba in the Province of Moxico, 500 kilometres from the Namibian border" [S/16035, para. 21].

I can do no better than to reiterate here today these pronouncements of the non-aligned countries.

71. Although I am speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, it might not be out of order for me to refer also to the Final Communiqué issued by the recently concluded Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting held at New Delhi from 23 to 29 November. Forty-two leaders of States, representing a wide cross-section of the world community, expressed their indignation at repeated violations by South Africa of the territorial integrity of neighbouring States. They declared:

"These acts of aggression, intended to intimidate and destabilize South Africa's neighbours, had involved for example ground and air strikes, attacks on refugee concentrations in Lesotho and Mozambique, the occupation of parts of Southern Angola, as well as economic sabotage and blackmail. Heads of Government condemned these acts which endangered international peace and security and showed a total disregard for the norms of civilized conduct between sovereign States. They believed that the international community as a whole had an obligation to take effective measures to impose restraint on South Africa, and to ensure that the stability of the region was not jeopardized by further acts of aggression. In that context they called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and an end to all forms of assistance to the subversive forces." [S/16206, annex, Final Communiqué, para. 13].

72. May I add that the Government and people of India wish to reaffirm their own full solidarity with

Angola and their support for its sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. We commend the Angolan people for their courageous and determined resistance in the face of Pretoria's belligerence.

73. When my delegation last addressed the Council on this item, on 29 August 1981, we cautioned this body against vacillation, equivocation or prevarication and urged its members to be alive to their responsibility under the Charter, calling upon them to take appropriate and resolute action, including the application of provisions under Chapter VII [2997th meeting, para. 84]. Regrettably, the draft resolution then before the Council [S/14664/Rev.2] could not see the light of day owing to the negative vote of a permanent member. Today, more than two years later, with the continued illegal occupation of territory unabated, acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization having grown in frequency and intensity and the unending brutalities and indignities heaped upon the people of the occupied territory, the Council can afford even less to vacillate. It must act decisively. The Council should condemn in unequivocal terms the aggression by South Africa and its continuing military occupation of parts of southern Angola and demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal by South Africa of all its occupation forces, as well as a commitment by it scrupulously to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. The Council should also ask for full compensation from South Africa for all the damages that have been inflicted on Angola over the last several years by South African aggression and occupation.

74. We believe at the same time that mere condemnation of South African aggression and a call upon South Africa to withdraw are not enough, for Pretoria has shown scant regard for such pronouncements. We continue to believe that if South Africa's intransigence persists, the Council must be prepared to adopt appropriate measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. That in turn would call for a display of the requisite political will on the part of all the members of the Council. We hope and trust that they can live up to our expectations in this regard.

75. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Botswana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

76. Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana): Let me begin, Sir, by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I must also congratulate your predecessor on the manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Council last month.

77. The leaders of Angola are deadly serious when they end their political statements with the clarion call, "The struggle continues; victory is certain". Theirs is a never-ending struggle for liberation, for Angola, unlike any other African country, has not, even after eight years of independence, tasted even one day of peace. It is indeed a country, a people, whose independence was

proclaimed—most unusually—to the general public in a fit of pique by a colonial Governor who was in a terrible hurry to sail away, literally, into the sunset. No instruments of power were transferred from the colonial Power to an independent Government, as was done in the other colonies. The Governor sailed away and left Angola to its own devices; and indeed, Angola is still left to its own devices today.

78. Angola is a country whose achievement of independence was almost thwarted by South Africa in 1975, a country which shares no border with South Africa, and yet which has been compelled to bring a complaint—a very serious complaint—before the Council about the occupation of its territory by South African troops. I must repeat that Angola shares no border with South Africa. The complaint Angola has brought before the Council has very little to do with the invasion of that country by South Africa in 1975 on the eve of its birth as a new nation. It has a great deal to do with the continued commission of various acts of aggression by South Africa against Angola, starting in 1975, and with the continued occupation of that country today, an occupation which began in 1981.

79. Since August 1981, thousands of South African troops have been occupying the southern part of Angola, in violation of the independence and territorial integrity of that country. The Angolan province of Cunene, in particular, has since become a permanent military base for South African troops. It is from that province that South African troops direct the murderous activities of the bandits of UNITA [*União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola*], in addition to carrying out their own ongoing campaign of the wanton destruction of Angola's economic infrastructure. Whole towns, villages, hospitals, schools, bridges and oil refineries have been destroyed, not to mention human lives. A White Paper published recently by the Government of Angola* tells the story more fully; it is a story so heart-rending, so tragic that none of us in this chamber can fail to be moved by it.

80. I am talking here about a country whose people, since their attainment of independence, have never ceased to seek—nay, to strive—to live in peace with all their neighbours in southern Africa, including South Africa, with which they share no frontier. The people of Angola have never ceased to proclaim that they are a peaceful people, who have never attacked or wished to attack anyone, and that all they want is to live in peace, working to build a future of well-being, progress and happiness in the just society they have freely chosen.

81. Angola could not wage a war of aggression against South Africa even if it had the inclination to do so. In the first place, the venture would be inescapably suicidal. In the second place, Angola would have to invade Namibia in order to reach South Africa across the

* Subsequently circulated as document S/16198.

Orange River, and it has no resources to embark on such a futile and costly venture.

82. That is the light in which South Africa's repeated acts of invasion and continued occupation of Angola should be seen. The invasion and occupation of Angola have not been provoked by Angola. They have been provoked by South Africa itself in an attempt to intimidate Angola and to deny the people of that country the right to be left alone to choose freely the political system under which they want to live.

83. It is not our intention to demand from the Council more than what we believe Angola deserves in terms of justice and equity. The Council should not—must not—by oversight or inaction, be seen or construed to be willing to countenance the persistent commission of acts of aggression against a small, weak, defenceless country.

84. What we seek from the Council is a firm and decisive call for the unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola, the cessation of the acts of aggression committed by South Africa against Angola, payment of reparations by South Africa for the massive havoc it has wrought in Angola, and scrupulous respect by all for Angola's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty.

85. South Africa must be compelled to respect Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, which enjoins all Member States to refrain in their relations with one another from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

86. South Africa must be compelled also to cease supporting the UNITA bandits, whose acts of banditry have caused so much destruction, death and suffering in Angola.

87. Peace for Angola is peace for southern Africa as a region, for Angola is not an isolated island insulated from the cares and concerns of our troubled subcontinent. South Africa's continued occupation of that sister front-line State and the consequences thereof have had

a negative, deleterious impact on prospects for peace in the region as a whole.

88. The region is already in the throes of escalating conflict brought about by the prevalence of racial injustice in South Africa and Namibia and by the recent emergence of the phenomenon of destabilization by which South Africa seeks to surround itself with thoroughly submissive neighbours.

89. However, as we have pointed out in the past, no country in southern Africa will allow itself to be rendered submissive to racial tyranny and injustice. None of us in the area harbours any warlike intentions towards South Africa. It would be foolish of us to harbour such intentions. But we are by the conviction of our moral principles committed to exposing the evils of *apartheid* and racial tyranny in South Africa.

90. Neither Angola, nor Botswana, nor Lesotho, nor Swaziland, nor Mozambique, nor Zambia, nor Zimbabwe, has anything to do with the bombs of war that explode in South Africa and Namibia today. *Apartheid* and racism and the occupation of Namibia by South Africa are solely responsible.

91. Neither the occupation of Angolan territory nor the unleashing of murderous dissidents on the countries of southern Africa will save *apartheid* from perdition. Nor can they save South Africa—not only the rest of us in southern Africa, but also South Africa—from the unspeakable tragedy that is bound to befall our region if South Africa cannot bring itself to the realization that the use of force to resist change is not the answer. The answers to the problems of our region are not hard to find. To the problem at issue, the problem we are discussing here, it is the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. That is the answer. To the problems of Namibia, the speedy implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) is the answer. To the problem of South Africa itself, the total abolition of *apartheid* and the democratization of South African society are the answer. Then, and only then, can all of us in southern Africa be redeemed, be rescued from the edge of the precipice on which we stand poised in this most frightening period in our history.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استمر منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店或向联合国驻当地或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences depositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишете по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
